

11-Xc
A 1016. h. #

DISSERTATION

UPON THE
Two EPISTLES

Ascribed to
CLEMENT of ROME,

Lately published
By Mr. WESTEIN.

With large
EXTRACTS out of them, and an Argument
shewing them not to be genuine.

By NATHANIEL LARDNER, D.D.

LONDON:

Sold by J. NOON in *Cheapside*, J. WAUGH, in *Lombard-Street*, and J. BUCKLAND in *Pater Noster Row*. M.DCC.LIII.

Price One Shilling.

DISCUSSION

THE TWO EPITLES

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE





The C O N T E N T S.

S E C T. I.

<i>EXTRACTS out of these Epistles, for shewing the Author's Testimonie to the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament.</i>	Page 1.
--	------------

S E C T. II.

<i>External Evidence against the Genuin- ness of these Epistles.</i>	7.
--	----

S E C T. III.

<i>Internal Evidence to the same Purpose, and their Time.</i>	31.
---	-----

S E C T. IV.

<i>The Author anonymous.</i>	54.
------------------------------	-----

S E C T. V.

<i>The Importance and Use of these Epistles.</i>	56.
--	-----

S E C T. VI.

<i>The Conclusion.</i>	58.
------------------------	-----

To

To be corrected.

A^T p. 7. l. 10. after snare, should be inserted these words.

And in another place: "We * do not sing
" psalms, nor read the Scriptures to Gentils."

* Propterea non psallimus Gentibus, neque legimus illis
Scripturas. *Ep. ii. c. 7.*

P. 27. l. 4. r. Centurie.

In the Notes.

P. 39. note (x) lin. 3. l. ἀπέχου.

P. 49. note (p) lin. 2. l. matrimonio.


A DIS-



A
DISSERTATION
UPON THE

Two Epistles ascribed to CLEMENT
of ROME, lately published by
Mr. WETSTEIN.

I. *Extracts out of these Epistles, for shewing the Author's Testimonie to the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament.* II. *External Evidence against the genuinnesse of these Epistles.* III. *Internal Evidence to the same Purpose, and their Time.* IV. *The Author anonymous.* V. *The Importance and Use of these Epistles.* VI. *The Conclusion.*

I.  Y extracts from these two epistles *Extracts.* will relate chiefly to the books of Scripture quoted therein.

I. In these epistles several books of the Old Testament are quoted: the book of Ge-

A Dissertation upon two new Epistles

nesis several times: *Exodus*: the Judges, and several of the following historical books: the book of the Proverbs, often: the book of Ecclesiastes once: *Isaiab* once, and also the storie of *Susanna*.

2. Out of the New Testament are taken several passages of *Matthew*, one (a) of *Luke*, several of *John's* Gospel. The Acts of the Apostles may be supposed (b) to be referred to. I cannot tell, whether (c) there be a reference to Acts xxvi. 25. in some words, which I place below, that others may judge. There are also passages out of the Apostle *Paul's* epistle to the *Romans*, both the epistles to the *Corinthians*, the epistles to the *Galatians*, the *Ephesians*, the *Philippians*, the *Colossians*, the first and second to the *Thessalonians*, the first and second to *Timothie*, the epistle to the *Hebrews*, two or three quotations, which will be taken notice of presently, and many passages out of the epistle of *James*.

But

(a) Domino Jesu Christo ministrarunt mulieres e possessionibus suis. *Ep. 2. n. 15. Vid. Luc. viii. 3.*

(b) Porro Paulus, et Barnabas, et Timotheus, cum ceteris, quorum nomina scripta sunt in libro vitae. *Ep. i. c. 6. Conf. Philipp. iv. 3.*

(c) . . et loquimur cum illis verba exhortationis et honestatis. *Ep. 2. cap. 1.*

But I have not clearly discerned any passages out of the epistle of *Paul* to *Titus*, or *Philemon*: nor out of the epistles of *Peter*, or *John*, or *Jude*, or the book of the Revelation.

3. I say, there are passages out of the several books of Scripture before mentioned. But there occurs not the name of any one book, or writer, either of the Old, or the New Testament: except in general, *in the Gospel*, *the Apostle*, meaning *Paul*, and the like.

4. The passages of the epistle to the *Hebrews* are these: "But (*d*) brethren, we are persuaded of you, that you will think of these things, which are necessarie to your salvation. But we thus speak of them, because," and what follows. Where the author must have had an eye to *Hebr.* vi. 9.

5. I suppose likewise, that there may be a reference to *Hebr.* vi. 15. . . 19. as well as to *Isaiab* lvi. in a passage, which (*e*) I transcribe below.

B 2

6. Again:

(*d*) Confidimus autem de vobis, fratres, vos cogituros ea, quae necessaria sunt salutis vestrae. Sed ita loquimur de iis, quae loquimur, propter famam et rumorem malum. &c. *Ep. i. c. 10.*

(*e*) . . sed desiderat spem promissam et praeparatam et positam

A Dissertation upon two new Epistles

6. Again: "For (*f*) he said: *Honor your Elders, and when you see their conversations, and their manners, imitate their faith.*" Which must be allowed to be a reference to, or quotation of Hebr. xiii. 7.

7. The forms of quotation are such as these: "For he said." In the place just quoted. "They (*g*) who are truly virgins, for God's sake, hear him, who said." Where he quotes divers passages from the book of the Proverbs. "Such (*b*) virginity the Lord calls *foolish*, as he says in the Gospel." See Matth. xxv. "Therefore (*i*) he said rightly to that generation." "And (*k*) of such servants it is said." "As (*l*) it is written." "And (*m*) they hear
"not

fitam in coelis Deo, qui promisit ore, et non mentitur: qui major est filiis et filiabus, et dabit virginibus locum celebrem in domo Dei *Ep. i. c. 4.*

(*f*) Dixit enim: Seniores vestros honorate, et quando videtis conversationes eorum, et mores eorum, imitamini eorum fidem. *Ep. i. c. 7.*

(*g*) Qui autem vere sunt virgines propter Deum, audiant eum qui dixit. *Ep. i. c. 2.*

(*b*) Dominus enim virginitatem talem stultam vocat, sicut ait in Evangelio. *Ep. i. c. 3.*

(*i*) Propterea recte dicit generationi tali. *Ep. i. 8.*

(*k*) Et dictum est de talibus servis. *i. 9.*

(*l*) Sicut scriptum est. *i. 10.*

(*m*) Et non audiunt dicentem. *i. 11.*

“ not him, who says.” Quoting the epistle of *James*. “ And (n) again he says.” “ Have
 “ (o) you not read of *Amnon* and *Thamar*,
 “ children of *David*? ” In the next chapter.
 “ Have (p) you not read of the familie of
 “ *Solomon*? ” “ They (q) did not remember
 “ that saying.” “ Behold (r) we find what
 “ is written of *Moses* and *Aaron*.” “ For
 “ (s) so the holy Scriptures speak in these
 “ very words.” “ As (t) the Apostle said.”
 See 2 Cor. xi. 12. “ Whom (u) the divine
 “ Apostle rejects.” “ Widows (x) whom
 “ the divine Apostle refuseth.” “ Let (y)
 “ us be mindful of the word, which says.”
 See *Eccles.* vii. 26. “ As (z) we have learned
 “ from the Law, the Prophets, and the
 “ Lord

(n) Et iterum dicit. i. 11.

(o) Nonne legisti de Amnone et Thamare, liberis Davidis?
 ii. c. 11.

(p) Nonne legisti de familia Salomonis, &c? ii. 12.

(q) Non enim recordati sunt dicti illius. &c. ii. 13.

(r) Ecce reperimus quod scriptum est de Mose et Aarone.
 ii. 14.

(s) Sic enim Scripturae sacrae testantur ad verbum. ii. 14.

(t) Sicut dixit Apostolus. i. 12.

(u) Quos averfatur Apostolus divinus. i. 10.

(x) . . aut cum viduis, quas fugit divinus Apostolus. ii. 14.

(y) . . fed simus memores verbi dicentis de muliere, ii. 10.

(z) Sicut didicimus de Lege, et Prophetis, et Domino Jesu
 Christo. i. 12.

A Dissertation upon two new Epistles

“ Lord Jesus Christ.” “ Let (a) us inquire
“ and search from the Law to the New
“ Testament.”

8. Farther he seems in several places to refer to a practise then in use of reading the Scriptures in private houses, and at visits.

For (b) he blames some, whom he calls idle, “ who went about to the houses of brethren, and sisters, virgins, under a pretense of
“ visiting them, or reading the Scriptures to
“ them, or exorcising them, or teaching
“ them.” Representing his own and other good people’s way of traveling, whose conduct is set forth to be an example, he says:
“ When (c) we come to a place, where
“ there is no man, but all are faithful women and virgins, when we have gathered
“ them

(a) *Inquiramus et scrutemur a Lege ad Novum Testamentum. ii. 7.*

(b) *Alii autem circumeuntes per domos virginum fratrum et fororum, praetextu visitandi eos, aut legendi Scripturas, aut exorcizandi eos, aut docendi eos, quia sunt otiosi. i. 10.*

(c) *Si autem contingat, ut nos recipiamus in locum, ubi vir non est: sed omnes sunt mulieres et virgines, cogantque nos pernoctare in illo loco: vocamus omnes illos in unum locum, ad latus dextrum. . . . et quando congregatae veniunt omnes, et videmus, quomodo in pace sunt, loquimur cum illis verba castitatis in timore Dei, et legimus illis Scripturas in verecundia. &c. ii. 4.*

“ them all together, and find they live
 “ in peace, we speak to them in all
 “ purity, and read to them the Scrip-
 “ tures.” Afterwards in the next chapter:
 “ If (d) we come to a place, and there be
 “ one faithful woman only alone, and no
 “ body else ; we do not stay there, nor pray
 “ there, nor read the Scriptures there, but
 “ we flee away as from the face of a serpent,
 “ and from a dangerous snare.”

II. Having made these extracts, it will be ^{External Evidence.} proper to consider the age and authority of the epistles, from whence they are taken. When it was first reported among us, that Mr. *Wetstein* of *Amsterdam* had received out of the East a *Syriac* translation of two new epistles of *Clement* Bishop of *Rome*, I said, it was a mistake. It was more probable, that he had received a *Syriac* translation of the epistle of *Clement* to the *Corinthians*, and of the other epistle often ascribed to him. And if

(d) Si autem recipiamus nos in locum, et inveniamus ibi unicam mulierem fidelem solam, nec quisquam alius ibi fit, nisi illa sola, non stamus ibi, neque oramus ibi, neque legimus ibi Scripturas, sed fugimus sicut coram facie serpentis, et tanquam coram laqueo peccati. ii. 5.

if that was the case, the translation might be very valuable, and of great use, because we have not the epistle to the *Corinthians* entire, and of the other epistle a fragment only. And undoubtedly those two epistles, if entire, though in a translation only, would have been an acceptable present to the learned world. But I was mistaken in my conjecture. The report first made has been confirmed by the event. The two epistles received by Mr. *Wetstein*, and published by him, have been hitherto (e) unknown. It must therefore be very fit, that we examine their title to this high original, before we receive them as genuine. In the first place I will consider the external, then the internal evidence.

In examining these epistles by external evidence we are led to recollect what ancient writers have said of *Clement*, and his works.

1. Says *Irenaeus*, Bishop of *Lyons* in *Gaul*, who flourished about the year 178. in his books

(e) Praecipuum vero, ut tandem ad rem ipsam veniam, manuscripti hujus ornamentum sunt duae Clementis Romani Epistolae, haecenus non ineditae solum, verum nostri temporis eruditis plane incognitae. *Wetst. Proleg. p. v.*

books against heresies: “ When (f) the blessed Apostles *Peter* and *Paul* had founded and established the church, [at Rome] they delivered the office of the bishoprick in it to *Linus*. . . . to him succeeded *Anencletus*. Next to whom, in the third place after the Apostles, *Clement* obtained the bishoprick, who had seen the blessed Apostles, and conversed with them. . . . In the time therefore of this *Clement*, when there was no small dissension among the brethren at *Corinth*, the church of *Rome* sent a most excellent letter to the *Corinthians*, exhorting them to peace among themselves, and reminding them of the doctrine lately received from the Apostles, which declares, that there is one God Almighty, maker of the heavens and the earth, who brought in the flood, and called *Abraham*, who brought the people out of *Egypt*, who spake with *Moses*, who ordained the law, and sent the Prophets.”

This is the only writing of *Clement*, which is taken notice of by *Irenaeus*. If he had known of any other, why should he not have

C

quoted

(f) *Iren. contr. Haer. l. 3. c. 3. p. 176. ed. Massuet. Et Conf. Euseb. H. E. l. 3. c. 15. et 16. et l. 5. c. 6.*

A Dissertation upon two new Epistles

quoted it, the more effectually to confute and silence the unreasonable men, against whom he was arguing?

2. *Dionysius*, Bishop of *Corinth*, flourished about the year 170. *Eusebe* mentions an epistle of his to *Soter* then Bishop of *Rome*. "In (g) which letter, says the ecclesiastical historian, he makes mention also of the epistle of *Clement* to the *Corinthians*, testifying, that it had been wont to be read in the church from ancient time, saying: *Today we have kept the holy Lord's day in which we read your epistle. Which we shall also read frequently for our instruction, as (h) well as the former, writ to us by Clement.*"

This, as seems to me, affords an irrefragable argument, that there was but one epistle of the church of *Rome*, writ by *Clement*, to the *Corinthians*.

3. We are also assured by *Eusebe*, that *Hegeſippus*, who flourished about the year 173. made (i) mention of the epistle of *Clement* to the *Corinthians*.

4. *Cle-*

(g) *Euseb. H. E. l. 4. c. 3. p. 145. B. C.*

(h) .. ὡς καὶ τὴν προτέραν ἡμῖν διὰ κλήμενος γραφεῖσαν.
Ibid.

(i) Αὐτοὶ γένοιτο πάρεσι μετὰ τινα περὶ τῆς κλήμενος πρὸς
κορινθίους



4. *Clement of Rome* is several times quoted by his name-fake of *Alexandria*, about the year 194. But he quotes only the epistle of (k) *Clement*, or (l) of the *Romans*, to the *Corinthians*.

5. *Origen*, about 230. has some passages out of *Clement's* epistle to the *Corinthians* in (m) his books of *Principles*, and in (n) his *Commentarie* upon *St. John's Gospel*. He elsewhere (o) quotes a work called *Circuits*, ascribed to *Clement*.

6. We come now to *Eusebe of Cesarea* about the year 315. who having mentioned the order of the succession of the first Bishops of *Rome* to *Clement*, whom he reckons the third after the Apostles, adds: "Of (p) this *Clement* there is one epistle acknowledged
" by all, a great and admirable epistle, which

C 2

" as

κορινθίους ἐπιστολῆς αὐτῶ ἐρημέναι. *H. E. l. 4. c. 22. in. Vid. et l. 3. c. 16.*

(k) Αὐτίκα ὁ κλήμης ἐν τῇ πρὸς κορινθίους ἐπιστολῇ κατὰ λέξιν φησί. *Str. l. i. p. 289. A. Paris. 1629. Vid. et Str. 4. p. 516. A. Str. 6. p. 647. A. B.*

(l) Ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ πρὸς κορινθίους ῥωμαίων ἐπιστολῇ. *Str. l. 5. p. 586. B.*

(m) *De Princip. l. 2. p. 82. et 83. Edit. Bened. T. i.*

(n) *Comm. in Jo. c. i. §. 29. T. 2. p. 143. Huet.*

(o) *Philoc. cap. 23. p. 81. Cant.*

(p) *H. E. l. 3. c. 15. et 16.*

A Dissertation upon two new Epistles

“ as from the church of *Rome* he wrote to
 “ the church of the *Corinthians*, upon occa-
 “ sion of a dissension, which there was then
 “ at *Corinth*. And we know, that this
 “ epistle has been formerly, and is still pub-
 “ licly read in many churches.”

In another place (*q*) he speaks of “ the
 “ epistle of *Clement* acknowledged by all, which
 “ he wrote to the *Corinthians*, in the name
 “ of the church of *Rome*.” Afterwards, in
 the same chapter: “ It ought to be ob-
 “ served, that there is another epistle said to
 “ be *Clement*’s. But this is not so generally
 “ received as the former. Nor do we know
 “ the ancients to have quoted it. There
 “ have been published also not long since
 “ other large and prolix writings in his name,
 “ containing Dialogues of *Peter* and *Appion*, of
 “ which there is not the least mention made
 “ by the ancients. Nor have they the pure
 “ apostolical doctrine.”

So writes *Eusebe*, who had so good oppor-
 tunities for acquainting himself with the writ-
 ings of Christians before his time: and, so
 far as we are able to judge, diligently em-
 proved those opportunities.

7. *Cyril*

(*q*) *L. 3. c. 3. p. 110.*

7. Cyril of Jerusalem, about the year 348. quotes (*r*), or refers to a passage of *Clement*, which is in his epistle to the *Corinthians*.

8. *Jerome* in his Catalogue, writ in 392. in the article of *Clement of Rome* expresseth himself in this manner: " He (*s*) wrote in " the name of the church of *Rome* to the " church of *Corinth* a very useful epistle, " which also is publicly read in some places. " . . . There is likewise a second epistle, which " goes under his name, but it is rejected by " the ancients. And a prolix Disputation of " *Peter* and *Appion*, which is censured by " *Eusebe* in the third book of his Ecclesiastical Historie."

Upon this chapter we are led to make some remarks. 1. There was but one epistle of *Clement* universally acknowledged. Which also was publicly read in some churches. 2. There was another epistle received as *Clement's*

(*r*) *Catech.* 18. n. viii. p. 288. edit. *Bened.*

(*s*) *Clemens*, de quo Apostolus ad Philippenses, . . . scripsit ex persona Romanae ecclesiae ad ecclesiam Corinthiorum valde utilem epistolam, quae et in nonnullis locis publice legitur . . . Fertur et secunda ejus nomine epistola, quae a veteribus reprobat. Et disputatio Petri et Apionis longo sermone conscripta, quam Eusebius in tertio Historiae Ecclesiasticae volumine coarguit. *De V. I. cap.* 15.

ment's by some in *Jerome's* time. But he says, it was *rejected by the ancients*, that is, was not quoted by them as *Clement's*. 3. *Jerome* does not expressly say, that this second epistle was supposed by any to have been writ to the *Corinthians*. But, possibly, some of those who received it, reckoned it to have been sent to the same church, to which the former epistle was sent. 4. *Jerome* was quite ignorant of any other epistles ascribed to *Clement*. Having mentioned those two epistles, he proceeds to the long Disputation, which *Eusebe* had censured. And doubtless ought to be understood to confirm that censure with his own approbation.

Clement is mentioned in some other works of *Jerome*: particularly, in (t) his Commentarie upon the Prophecie of *Isaiab*. Where he expressly quotes the epistle of *Clement* Bishop of *Rome* to the *Corinthians*. And much after the same manner twice (u) in his Commentarie

(t) De quo et Clemens, vir apostolicus, qui post Petrum Romanam rexit ecclesiam, mittit ad Corinthios. In *Is. cap. 52. T. 3. p. 382.*

(u) De quibus et Clemens in epistola sua scribit. In *ep. ad Eph. cap. iii. v. 2. T. 4. P. i. p. 338.*

Cujus rei et Clemens ad Corinthios testis est. In *Eph. cap. iv. v. 1. ib. p. 359.*

mentarie upon the epistle to the *Ephesians*. *Clement* is also mentioned by *Jerome* in the fifth chapter of the book of *Illustrious Men*, where is the article of *St. Paul*, in speaking of the epistle to the *Hebrews*. He is also mentioned (x) elsewhere.

There is yet one passage more of *Jerome*, of which particular notice must be taken. It is in his first book against *Jovinian*: who, as *Jerome* assures us, beside other things, said, “ that (y) virgins have no more merit than “ widows and married women, unless their “ works distinguish them in other respects: “ and likewise, that there is no difference of “ merit between abstaining from some meats “ and using them with thanksgiving.” Our author having quoted *Matth. xix. 12.* says: “ To (z) such [eunuchs] *Clement* also succe- “ for

(x) Et si Clemens, aut ille Apostolorum discipulus, aut ille Alexandrinae ecclesiae, et ipsius magister Origenis, tale aliquid dixerunt. *Adv. Rufin. l. 2. p. 406. T. 4. P. 2.*

(y) Dicit, virgines, viduas, et maritatas, quae semel in Christo lotae sunt, si non discrepent ceteris operibus ejusdem esse meriti . . . Tertium proponit, inter abstinentiam ciborum, et cum gratiarum actione perceptionem eorum, nullam esse distantiam. *Adv. Jovin. l. 1. T. 4. p. 146.*

(z) Ad hos [eunuchos] et Clemens successor Apostoli Petri, cujus Paulus Apostolus meminit, scribit epistolas, omnemque pene

“ for of the Apostle *Peter*, of whom the
 “ Apostle *Paul* makes mention, [Philip. iv.
 “ 3.] writes epistles, and almost throughout
 “ discourseth of the purity of virginity. And
 “ in like manner, [or and afterwards] many
 “ apostolical men, and martyrs, and others,
 “ illustrious for their piety and eloquence, as
 “ may be easily seen in their own writings.”

Mr. *Wetstein*, whose (a) words I transcribe
 below,

pene sermonem suum de virginitatis puritate contexuit: et deinceps multi Apostolici, et Martyres, et illustres tam sanctitate quam eloquentia viri, quos ex propriis scriptis nosse perfacile est. *Id. ibid. p. 156. m.*

(a) . . . quarum γυναικῶν et utilitatem nunc indicare atque demonstrare conabor. Proferam primò duo externa testimonia Hieronymi atque Epiphani, quorum ille c. Jovinianum l. 1. *Hi*, inquit, *sunt eunuchi, quos castravit non necessitas, sed voluntas propter regnum coelorum. . . . Ad hos et Clemens successor Apostoli Petri, cujus Paulus Apostolus meminit* [Philip. iv. 3] *scribit epistolas, omnemque pene sermonem suum de virginitatis puritate contexuit: et deinceps multi apostolici et martyres, et illustres tam sanctitate quam eloquentia viri, quos ex propriis scriptis nosse perfacile est.* Hic vero Haer. xxx. Ebionitarum n. 15. *Αὐτὸς κλήμης. . . .* Haec tamen testimonia de nostris epistolis, quae nemo non videt esse clarissima, et a Petavio et Martianaëo, Epiphani et Hieronymi editoribus, et ab omnibus, quotquot illa epistolis Clementis ad Corinthios praefixa legerunt, et a scriptoribus ecclesiasticae historiae, qui de Clemente egerunt, neglecta, id est, non intellecta, aut perperam de duabus istis ad Corinthios epistolis, in quibus tamen nec Sampsonis, nec prolixus de virginate sermo reperitur, intellecta fuere. *Wetst. Prolegom. p. v.*

below, says, that here *Jerome* refers to the two epistles published by him. But 1. *Jerome* must be understood to mean the two well known epistles of *Clement*, of which he had spoken in his Catalogue: which are plainly the same, and no other than those spoken of by *Eusebe* of *Cesarea* in his Ecclesiastical Historie, to which he refers, and indeed transcribes. It is the more reasonable, and even expedient, so to understand him, because the books against *Jovinian* were writ about the same time with the Catalogue: from which it appears, that he had then no knowledge of any other epistles of *Clement*. If he had, he would not have omitted there to take notice of them. And in his other works, as we have seen, he quotes no epistle of *Clement*, but his well known, and universally received epistle to the *Corinthians*. Here he speaks of two, it having been then not uncommon to ascribe to *Clement* another epistle, beside that, which was universally received by the ancients, as we saw him acknowledge in the Catalogue. 2. *Jerome* here speaks hyperbolically, a stile very frequent with him, as all know, and especially in his books against *Jovinian*: where he so exalted virginity, and

D

depre-

depreciated marriage, as to give general offense, though at that time virginity was in great esteem. In those epistles, says *Jerome*, *Clement* discourseth almost throughout of the purity of virginity. The meaning of which, really, is no more, than that there are in his epistles some things favorable to virginity. *Jerome* may be supposed to refer to some things in ch. 21. 29. 30. 35. 38. 48. and 58. of the epistle to the *Corinthians*: particularly, to such places as these, where *Clement* says:

“ Let (b) our [or your] children partake of
 “ the discipline of Christ. . . . Let them
 “ know, how much a chaste love avails
 “ with God, how great and excellent his
 “ fear is, saving all who serve him in holiness with a pure mind.” “ We (c) being
 “ the portion of the holy one, let us do all
 “ things that pertain unto holiness, shunning impure and unchaste embraces.”

Among the blessed and wonderful gifts of God *Clement* reckons (d) “ continence, [or
 “ chastity] in holiness.” Again: “ Let
 “ there-

(b) . . . τὴ ἀγάπῃ ἀγνὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ δύναται. . . κ. λ.
Ep. ad Corinth. cap. 21.

(c) *Ibid. cap. 30.*

(d) . . . ἐγκράτεια ἐν ἁγιασμῷ. c. 35.

“(e) therefore our whole body be saved in
 “Jesus Christ.” Afterwards, in the same
 chapter: “Let (f) not him that is chaste [or
 “pure] in the flesh, grow proud, knowing
 “that it is from another he received the gift
 “of continence.” And near the end he
 prays, “That (g) God may give them patience,
 “long-suffering, continence, chastity, and
 “sobriety.” To these and other things in
 the epistle to the *Corinthians* *Jerome* (h) may
 be supposed to refer. And he may intend a
 large part of that which is called *Clement's* se-
 cond epistle: in which are recommended
 chastity, self-denial, and mortification to the
 delights of this world. *Jerome* might have
 a regard to that epistle from chapter 4. to
 chapter 12. that is, the end, so far as we
 have it. Where are such expressions as these:

D 2

“keep-

(e) Σωζέσω τὸ ἡμῶν ὅλον σῶμα ἐν χριστῷ ἰησοῦ. c. 38.

(f) Ὁ ἄγνός ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ μὴ ἀλαζονεύεσθω, γινώσκων, ὅτι
 ἕτερός ἐστιν ὃ ἐπαίχοιτο αὐτῷ τὴν ἐγκράτειαν. *Ibid.*

(g) . . . μακροθυμίαν, ἐγκράτειαν, ἀγνείαν, καὶ σωφροσύνην.
cap. 58.

(h) Et posteriora quidem loca de continentia virginali aperte
 loquuntur, priora vero licet castitatem in genere, ipsamque
 conjugalem, concernant, ab Hieronymo tamen in disputa-
 tionis fervore aliorum trahi potuerunt. *Græc. Spic. T. i.*
p. 263.

“ keeping (i) the flesh chaste.” “ We (k)
 “ ought therefore to keep our flesh as the
 “ temple of God.” “ Serving (l) God with
 “ a pure heart.” And the like. That such
 expressions as these may be the foundation of
 what he says, is manifest from what imme-
 diately precedes the passage, which we are
 considering. “ It (m) is, says he, an act of
 “ eminent faith, and eminent virtue, to be
 “ a holy temple of God, to offer ourselves a
 “ whole burnt-offering to the Lord. [Rom.
 “ xii. 1.] and, according to the same Apostle,
 “ to be holy both in body and spirit. [1 Cor.
 “ vii. 34.] These are eunuchs, who in *Isaiah*
 “ call themselves a dry tree. . . To these
 “ eunuchs *Clement* writes.” . . . The hyper-
 bolical stile appears likewise in what follows:
In like manner many apostolical men, and Mar-
tyrs, and others illustrious for their piety and
eloquence,

(i) . . καὶ τὴν σάρκα ἀγνὴν τηρήσαντες. *Ep. 2. cap. 8.*

(k) Δεῖ ἐν ἡμῶς αἷς ναὸν θεῷ φυλάσσειν τὴν σάρκα. *cap. 9.*

(l) Ἡμεῖς ὅν ἐν καθαρᾷ καρδίᾳ δαλεύσωμεν τῷ θεῷ. *Ib.*
c. xi.

(m) Grandis fidei est, grandisque virtutis, Dei templum
 esse purissimum, totum se holocaustum offerre Domino, et
 juxta eundem Apostolum, esse sanctum et corpore et spiritu,
 Hi sunt eunuchi, qui se lignum aridum ob sterilitatem putan-
 tes, audiunt per *Isaiam* &c.

eloquence, as may be easily seen in their own writings. It is true, that many, beside Clement, have discoursed of chastity, and of purity in soul and body. But who are they, of whom it can be said, without an hyperbole, that they had writ books, *discoursing almost throughout of the purity of virginity?* And where are their writings to be found? Dr. Cave (n) understood Jerome exactly after this manner. As did (o) Grabe likewise. Whose remarks upon this passage of Jerome are so clear, and full, and, as seems to me, satisfactorie; that I think it great pity, Mr. Wetstein

(n) Ceterum haud satis conitat, quid sibi velit Hieronymus, cum de epistolis a Clemente ad Corinthios scriptis verba faciens, omnem pene sermonem suum de virginitatis puritate Clementem contexuisse, scribat. Neque enim alias ab hisce quae nunc exstant epistolas ad Corinthios dedisse Clementem credi potest, nec in his utramque faciunt paginam virginitatis laudes. Sed potius dicendum videtur, Hieronymum nimio virginitatis studio abreptum hyperbolica dictione usum esse, cumque Clemens pauculos periodos animi corporisque puritati docendae impendat, totum sermonem virginatis encomio dicatum esse voluisse. *H. L. T. i. p. 20. De Clemente.*

(o) Hieronymus vero acriter disputans contra errorem Joviniani, eandem conjugii ac virginitatis dignitatem coram Deo statuentis, hyperbolice ait, *Clementem omnem pene sermonem suum de virginitatis puritate contexuisse.* Quales hyperbolicae locutiones in ipsius scriptis, inque ipso illo contra Jovinianum, haud infrequentes occurrunt. *Spic. T. i. p. 264.*

Wetstein did not observe and well consider them. If he had so done, it might have prevented those scornful reflexions upon Dr. *Cave*, and Bishop *Beveridge*, and the two learned editors of *Epiphanius* and *Jerome*, which are at p. v. of the *Prolegomena*. *Godfrey Wendelin*, as cited by Mr. *Wetstein* *Prolegom.* p. vi. supposed, that *Jerome* had an eye to the later part of the second epistle, which is now wanting. And to the like purpose *Cotelerius* (*p*) in his note at the end of that fragment. And indeed it has seemed to me not improbable, that *Jerome* reckoned, he had an advantage to his cause from the second epistle ascribed to *Clement*. And therefore here writing against *Jovinian*, when his mind was heated with his argument, he speaks of two epistles of *Clement*: though in his Catalogue, where he writes as a critic, and an historian, he speaks as if he thought one only to be genuine. Nor has he quoted any other in his Commentaries. Nevertheless I am of opinion, that we have enough remain-

(*p*) Verisimile fit ex Epiphanio H. 30. cap. 15. et Hieronymo i. adversus Jovinianum 7. Apostolicum nostrum in iis quae desiderantur istius epistolae, de virginitate differuisse non paucis. *Cot. ap. Patr. Ap.* p. 188.

remaining of these two epistles, and particularly of that last mentioned, to justify our interpretation of *Jerome*: especially with that qualifying expression *almost*. Which no man can think to be a mere expletive. 3. I observe farther. If *Jerome* had intended the two epistles published by Mr. *Wetstein*, he would have said: *to these eunuchs Clement wrote two whole epistles in praise of virginity, and teaching how it may be kept pure and incorrupt*. And the remaining part of the sentence, relating to other apostolical men, and other eminent writers, would likewise have been different. 4. If *Jerome* had had these two epistles before him, and had supposed them to be writ by *Clement of Rome*, he would not have failed to make great use of them in his books against *Jovinian*, and in his Apologie for them. Moreover they would also have been often quoted in his other writings, where he recommends virginity, and gives directions about preserving it.

9. *Epiphanius*, who flourished about A.D. 368. and afterwards, in his article of the heresie of the *Carpocratians*, speaking of the first Bishops of *Rome*, quotes *Clement* thus.

“ For

“ For (q) he says in one of his epistles.” The passage there quoted is in the 54. chapter of the epistle to the *Corinthians*, which we have. Hereby we perceive, that *Epiphanius* acknowledged more than one epistle of *Clement*. And we have learned from *Jerome*, that about that time it was not uncommon to speak of two epistles, as writ by *Clement*.

In another place, the heresie of the *Ebionites*, says *Epiphanius*: “ There are other “ books used by them, as the circuits of *Peter*, writ by *Clement*: [probably meaning “ the Recognitions] in which they have “ made many interpolations. But (r) *Clement* himself confutes them in the circular “ letters writ by him, which are read in the “ holy churches. . . He teaches virginity, “ which they reject. He commends *Elias*, “ and *David*, and *Sampson*, and all the Prophets, whom they abuse.”

Mr.

(q) Λέγει γὰρ ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν αὐτοῦ. κ. λ. H. 27. n. 6. p. 107.

(r) . . ὅς αὐτὸς κλήμης αὐτὸς κατὰ πάντα ἐλέγχει, ἀφ' ὧν ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολὰν ἐγκυκλίαν τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἀγίαις ἐκκλησίαις ἀναγνωσσκομένων . . Αὐτὸς γὰρ παρθενίαν διδάσκει, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐδέχονται. Αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐγκωμιάζει ἡλίαν καὶ δαβὶδ καὶ σαμψὼν, καὶ πάντας τοὺς προφῆτας, οἷς ἔτοι βδελύττωται. H. 30. n. xv. p. 139.

Mr. *Wetstein* (s) thinks, that *Epiphanius* here intends the epistles published by him. But to me it appears plain, that *Epiphanius* intends the two epistles spoken of by *Eusebe* in his Ecclesiastical Historie, and by *Jerome* in his Catalogue, and which we have had published now above a centurie by *Patrick Young*, from whence several other editions have been since made. For the epistles here spoken of by *Epiphanius* were circular, and read in the churches. So were ours. Indeed *Eusebe* and *Jerome* speak of but one only publicly read in Christian assemblies. But the other might be so read likewise. There is reason to think, that both were read in some churches. For the 85. apostolical canon, as it is called, reckons two epistles of *Clement* among the books of the New (t) Testament. And our two epistles were at the end of the *Alexandrian* manuscript, after the books of Scripture generally received. Which affords an argument, that both these epistles were publicly read in the place, where it was writ. And it should be taken notice of by us, that here we have two new witnesses to the num-

E

ber

(s) See before note (a). p. 16.

(t) Κλήμεντος ἐπιστολαὶ δύο.

ber of *Clement's* epistles, as two only. If *Jerome* could say of our epistles, (as we have seen he might) that *Clement almost throughout discourseth of the purity of virginity, Epiphanius might say, he teacheth it.* He also says, that *Clement commends Elias, David, Sampson, and all the Prophets.* Which is the proper character of *Clement's* epistle to the *Corinthians*, though not the whole of it, and particularly insisted on by that early writer *Irenaeus*: in which, says he, *Clement exhorts the Corinthians to peace among themselves, and reminds them of the doctrine lately received from the Apostles: which declares, that there is one God Almighty, maker of the heavens and the earth, who called Abraham, who spake to Moses, and sent the Prophets.* All which perfectly suits the epistle to the *Corinthians*, which we still have in our hands, and in the name of *Clement*, as may appear to any upon consulting ch. 17. 18. 19. 20. 43. and other places. Mr. *Wetstein* objects, that *Sampson* is not named in the epistle just mentioned, whereas he is in *his*. But though we do not now find *Sampson's* name in what remains of that epistle, he may have been there. And as we have it not entire, I think, it would
be

be presumption to say, he was not there named.

10. *Photius*, Patriarch of *Constantinople* in the ninth ceniurie, has two articles for *Clement* Bishop of *Rome*. In the first he says, “ that (u) *Clement* wrote a valuable epistle to “ the *Corinthians*, which is so esteemed by “ many, as to be read publicly. But that “ which is called the second to the same is “ rejected as spurious.”

In the other article he speaks (x) of two epistles of *Clement* to the *Corinthians*, bound together in one book or volume. And he distinctly gives the character of each, with regard to their stile and doctrine. But says nothing particularly about the genuinneſſe of either.

11. *Nicephorus Callisti*, in the 14. centurie, ſo agrees with *Eusebe* of *Cesarea*, that I need not to take any particular notice of him.

12. Mr. *Wetſtein* (y) ſeems to ſuppoſe,
E 2 that

(u) Αυτὸς καὶ ἐπιτολὴν ἀξιόλογον πρὸς κορινθίους γράφει, ἥτις παρὰ πολλοῖς ἀποδοχῆς ἡξιάθη, ὡς καὶ δημοσίᾳ ἀναγινώσκεισθαι. Ἡ δὲ λεγόμενη δευτέρα πρὸς αὐτὸς ὡς νόθῃ ἀποδοκιμάζεται. *Cod.* 113. p. 289.

(x) Αναγνώθη βιβλιδάριον, ἐν ᾧ κλήμεντος ἐπιστολαὶ πρὸς κορινθίους δύο ἀναφέροντο. *Cod.* 126. p. 305.

(y) *Prolegom.* p. vii. m.

that *Dionysius Barsalibi*, Bishop of *Amida* near the end of the twelfth centurie, of whom there is an account in Dr. *Asseman's* Bibliotheca Orientalis, speaks of another letter of *Clement* writ against those who rejected marriage. “*Barsalibi*, says (z) *Asseman*, beside “*Ephrem*, *Chrysostom*, and other authors, “cites an epistle of *Clement* against those “who rejected marriage.” Upon which I observe, 1. It does not certainly appear, what *Clement* is here spoken of. 2. If *Clement* of *Rome* be intended, *Barsalibi* must mean one of the two epistles spoken of by *Eusebe*, *Jerome*, *Epiphanius*, and *Photius*, provided he deserves any regard. For there never were any other epistles ascribed to him by learned Christians in former times. And it may be reckoned very likely, that *Barsalibi* cited the ~~same~~ epistle of *Clement* to the *Corinthians*, particularly ch. i. or xxi. So, on account of some things in that epistle *Epiphanius* might say, that *Clement* teaches virginity, and *Jerome*, that almost throughout he discourseth of
the

(z) Praeter Ephraemum vero, Chrysostomum, . . quibus Barsalibaeum usum fuisse, supra dixi, auctores hi ab ipso citantur. videlicet: Dionysius epist. ad Timotheum: Clemens adversus eos qui matrimonium rejiciunt. *Asseman. Bib. Or. T. 2. p. 58.*

the purity of virginity. And with regard to some other passages *Barsalibi* might say, that *he wrote against those who rejected marriage.* In like manner a learned writer might say, that *St. Paul* in his epistles recommends virginity, and another, suitably to the argument, of which he is treating, may say, he vindicates marriage. And both those authors would be understood to mean the same epistles. Yea they might both cite, or refer to one and the same epistle, for their several ends and purposes, particularly, the first epistle to the *Corinthians*. Not now to instance in any other.

13. Mr. *Wetstein* says farther, “ that (a) “ probably these two epistles were suppressed; or laid aside, because of the strictness “ of the rules of piety contained therein.” Which to me appears a false and injurious reflexion upon the Christians of the early ages. There always were, especially in the first five centuries, Pastors, and other eminent men, who approved of, and were themselves able

(a) *Tantum vero abest ut mirer, austeram Clementis disciplinam in epistolis istis traditam non placere, ut potius propter hanc ipsam causam eas et dudum sepositas esse, et per tot secula in tenebris latuisse existimem. Proleg. p. vii. fin.*

able to give right instructions for a good life. Nor can it be denied, that they were sufficiently zealous for virginity. They have preserved and handed down to us the Scriptures of the New Testament, than which no writings whatever have delivered better directions for the practise of strict virtue. And why should any man think, that the primitive Christians would designedly suppress any writings of *Clement of Rome*, who was highly esteemed by all catholics in general, and by some others likewise? Insomuch that there were works forged in his name, and ascribed to him, which had not the apostolical doctrine. We are well assured, that his epistle to the *Corinthians* was read in many churches, and the other likewise in some. If there had been any other epistles of *Clement*, they would have been esteemed, and often quoted, and not suppressed, or laid aside in obscurity. And how comes *Mr. Wetstein* now to speak of *his* epistles as obscure, when before he supposed them to be the same that had been quoted by *Jerome* in his books against *Jovianian*, and the same, which *Epiphanius* said were read in the holy churches? Are these things consistent?

14. Upon the whole it appears to me very clear, that there never were more than two epistles of *Clement* Bishop of *Rome*, received by Christians in former times. Those two I suppose to be the same, which are at the end of the *Alexandrian* Manuscript, and now are, and for more than a centurie have been well known to the learned. Suppose a man should say, that he had found two epistles of the Apostle *Paul*, or the Apostle *Peter*, which for many ages past have been unknown: would he deserve to be credited? It is almost as strange and surprizing, for any man to say the like of *Clement* of *Rome*, a man so highly esteemed in all antiquity, and so much taken notice of by *Irenaeus*, *Clement* of *Alexandria*, *Eusebe*, *Jerome*, *Photius*, and others. The epistles therefore, which have been published by Mr. *Wetstein*, are not *Clement's*. They cannot be his. There is no need to open the packet. Thus much may be certainly known, without looking into it.

III. However, as we have already taken a *Internal Evidence*. view of these epistles, and have made some extracts out of them, we will now examine them more distinctly. And however good and

and pious they may be, it is likely, there will still offer more reasons for confirming the persuasion, that they were not writ by *Clement*.

1. And in the first place I observe, that the quotations of Scripture, and forms of quoting the Scriptures, in these epistles, are different from those in the universally acknowledged epistle to the *Corinthians*. For that is the epistle, to which I shall have an eye: it being, in my opinion (A) the only genuine

(A) I am not singular in that opinion, which is much confirmed, as any may perceive, by the testimonies of ancient writers largely alleged here in the article of external evidence. *H. Grotius* declared himself to the like purpose in the year 1634. in his judgement upon these epistles, the year after their publication by *P. Young*. Alteram epistolam, cujus fragmentum additum est, quamquam Clementis et ipsa in libris nonnullis nomen praetulit, non esse tamen ei tribuendam, etiam veteres judicarunt. Quorum auctoritati accedit characteris diversitas. *H. Gr. ep. 347*. *Grabe*, who has since carefully examined the early writings of Christianity, is clearly of the same opinion, induced thereto chiefly by the letter of *Dionysius* Bishop of *Corinth*, and the silence of ancient writers before *Eusebe* concerning any second epistle of *Clement*. . . . pluraque sunt, quae pene demonstrare mihi videntur, epistolam secundam Clementis ad Corinthios supposititiam esse. Et primo quidem maxime considerandum est testimonium *Dionysii*, Episcopi Corinthiorum, proxime post Clementem seculo florentis . . . *Spic. p. 263*. Secundum argumentum contra secundam Clementi adscriptam epistolam suppeditat silentium omnium antiquorum

genuine writing of that apostolical man, *Clement of Rome*. 1.) The author of these epistles useth some phrases and expressions concerning the Scriptures not found in *Clement*, nor in any of the apostolical Fathers; that I remember. *As we have learned from the Law, and the Prophets, and the Lord Jesus Christ: the Law and the New Testament: the Divine Apostle*. 2.) In these epistles many more (B) books of the New Testament are quoted, than in the acknowledged epistle of *Clement*. 3.) This writer's forms of quotation of the Old Testament are different from those of *Clement*. What are this writer's forms may be seen in the extracts at the begining of this dissertation. In *Clement's*

F

epistle

quorum Patrum, apud quos nullam ejus vel citationem invenit Eusebius . . . *Ibid* p. 267. And indeed, it seems strange to me, that any learned men should still quote the second epistle as *Clement's*.

(B) What Books of the New Testament are quoted or alluded to by *Clement*, may be seen in his epistle, and in the large extracts made out of it in the first volume of this work ch. ii. And at the conclusion of ch. iii. where are extracts out of the fragment of the second epistle ascribed to *Clement*, it was observed, that therein the Gospels are several times quoted more expressly, than in *Clement's* epistle to the *Corinthians*. This was there taken notice of as an internal character, confirming the supposition, that it had not the same author with the epistle to the *Corinthians*, and that it is of a later date.

epistle to the *Corinthians* the forms of quotation are such as these. "The (b) ministers
 " of the grace of God have spoken of re-
 " pentance by the Holy Spirit. And himself
 " the Lord of all has spoken of repentance
 " with an oath." See Ezek. xxxiii. "And
 " (c) let us do that which is written. For
 " the Holy Spirit says." And in the same
 chapter or section. "For (d) the holy word
 " says." And in another chapter. "For
 " (e) himself bespeaketh us by the Holy
 " Spirit." "Look (f) into the holy Scrip-
 " tures, which are the true sayings of the
 " Holy Spirit." Which forms of citation
 do not occur in the epistles published by Mr.
Wetstein. I omit those common forms, in
 the same epistle to the *Corinthians*, "It (g)
 " is writ, and (h) the Scripture says, and
 " the like." 4.) *Clement's* quotations of
 texts of Scripture, especially of the Old Te-
 stament, which are large and numerous, are
 neat and distinct. But the writer of these
 two epistles jumbles texts and books together,
 and

(b) *Ep. ad Corinth. c. 8.*

(c) *Ib. cap. 13.*

(d) *Ibid.*

(e) *Cap. 22.*

(f) *Cap. 45.*

(g) *Γέγραπται γὰρ. cap. iv.*

(h) *Λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή. cap. xxxi. et passim.*

and quotes in a very confused manner. How *Clement* quotes may be seen by any, who look into his epistle. Having quoted a passage of Scripture, when he proceeds to take another passage out of another book, or out of the same book, he usually says: "And (i) in another place," or the like. I do not deny, that (k) the writer of these epistles does also sometimes make use of like forms of transition. But oftentimes his quotations are exceedingly jumbled and confused. For instance: "Therefore (l) he rightly said
 " to such a generation: *My Spirit shall not*
 " *always dwell with man, because they are*
 " *flesh. Every one therefore in whom is not*
 " *the Spirit of Christ, he is not his. As it is*
 " *written: The Spirit of the Lord departed*
 " *from Saul, and an evil spirit from the Lord*
 " *troubled him.*" See Gen. vi. 3. Rom. viii.
 9. 1. Sam. xvi. 14.

2. Mr. *Wetstein* as an instance of agreement between the epistle of *Clement*, and the epistles published by him, says, that there is

F 2

a doxo-

(i) Καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ τόπῳ λέγει. cap. viii. Καὶ πάλιν ἐν ἑτέρῳ τόπῳ λέγει. cap. 46. et passim.

(k) Ep. i. cap. 11.

(l) Ep. i. cap. 8.

a doxologie (*m*) in the middle of one of them. I suppose, that Mr. *W*—— may refer to the sixth chapter of his second epistle, at the end of which there is an Amen. But I see not there, nor any where else in these epistles, neither in the middle, nor at the endings of them, one doxologie. Which therefore leads me to observe another difference between these epistles, and the generally received epistle of *Clement* to the *Corinthians*. For in that epistle, as has been often observed by learned men, there are at least seven or eight doxologies.

*The Time
of these
Epistles.*

3. There are several things in these epistles, which will directly lead us to the time and occasion of writing them, and assure us of their late age.

A passage above cited shews, that when these epistles were writ, Gentilism was not extinct in the Roman Empire. For I allow, that they were not first writ in *Syriac*, but in *Greek*, as Mr. *Wetstein* well argues. When therefore this author said, as above: *we do not read the Scriptures to Gentils*: I reckon it a proof, that Gentilism still subsisted in the countrey, where he lived. Which indeed I
imagine

(*m*) Stylus, *δοξολογία* in media epistola. *Proleg. p. vi. med.*

imagine to have been somewhere in the Eastern part of the Roman Empire.

Farther, these epistles were not writ, untill after some ecclesiastics had begun to have with them what were called subintroduced women : nor till after it had been taken notice of, and censured. Upon this subject the late learned Mr. *Henry Dodwell* (n) has a curious dissertation. *Bingham* (o) likewise may be consulted. And some notice has been already taken of it in this work (p) particularly in the historie of *Paul of Samosata*.

There were some unmarried clergymen, who, for the sake of domestic affairs, had women to live with them. *Dodwell* (q) says, they were virgins consecrated to God. *Bingham* says, " They (r) were commonly some of the virgins belonging to the church, whom they that entertained pretended only to love as sisters with a chaste love." It appears from *St. Cyprian*, that

(n) *Diff. Cypr. iii. De flagitio mulierum cum Clericis concumbentium. &c.*

(o) *Antiquities of the Church. B. 6. Ch. 2. §. 13. Vol. 2. p. 329. . . 332.*

(p) *Vol. 4. ch. 43. p. 616. . . 618.*

(q) *Ubi supr. n. i. ii.*

(r) *As before p. 331.*

that (s) they dwelled together in the same house, and sometimes lodged in the same room, and in the same bed. To the like purpose (t) speaks *Jerome*. Nevertheless they made solemn declarations of their innocence, and gave such assurances of being unpolluted by carnal commerce, as were satisfactory. So says *Mr. Dodwell* (u) upon the
 autho-

(s) Legimus literas tuas, frater carissime, . . postulans et desiderans, ut tibi rescriberemus, quid nobis de iis virginibus videatur, quae cum in statu suo esse, et continentiam firmiter genere decreverant, detestae sint postea in eodem lecto pariter mansisse cum masculis: ex quibus unum esse Diaconum dicis: plane easdem quae se cum viris dormisse confessae sint, asseverare se integras esse. . . Primo igitur in loco, . . elaborandum est. . . nec pati virgines cum masculis habitare, non dico simul dormire, sed nec simul vivere. *Cyprian. ep. 4. al. 62.*

(t) Unde in ecclesias Agapetarum pellis introit! Unde sine nuptiis aliud nomen uxorum! . . . Eadem domo, uno cubiculo, saepe uno tenentur et lectulo, et suspiciosos nos vocant, si aliquid existimamus. *Ad. Euseb. ep. 18. al. 22. T. 4. p. 33.*

(u) Quid deinde illud . . . quod cum summo animi nostri gemitu et dolore cognovimus, non deesse qui Dei templa et post confessionem sanctificata et illustrata membra turpi et infami concubitu suo plus maculent, cubilia sua cum feminis promiscua jungentes, quando etsi stupram conscientiae eorum desit, hoc ipso grande crimen est, quod illorum scandalo in aliorum ruinas exempla nascuntur. [*Cyprian. ep. 6. al. 7. al. 13.*] Constat itaque, qui ita cum mulieribus concumberent, carnis tamen integritatem servasse illibatam. *Dodwell ubi supra. n. i.*

authority of a passage of St. *Cyprian* : which however still declares the practise to be unrespectable, and offensive. *Leontius* the *Arian* Bishop of *Antioch* is censured by *Athanasius* (x) for cohabiting with a virgin. And he may be reckoned to be one of those, who gave proof of his freedom from carnal commerce.

We cannot dispute the truth of what St. *Cyprian* says, that in *Africa* some of these ecclesiastics and their virgins lay in the same room, and in the same bed. Nevertheless perhaps there were very few instances of this sort. St. *Chrysostom* has two homilies or orations upon this subject. One is “ against those who had “ with them subintroduced virgins.” The other, “ that canonical women ought not “ to dwell [or cohabit] with men.” It may be allowed, that he treats those whom he reproves with a good deal of politeness and tenderness. Nevertheless his argument is very cogent. Nor can any imagine, that *John Chrysostom* would extenuate the guilt of those

(x) Ὁ μὲν γὰρ λεόντιος διαβαλλόμενος, μετὰ γυναίκῃ
τινὶ νεωτέρας, λεγομένης εὐστολῆς, καὶ καλούμενης συνοικεῖν
αὐτῇ, δι’ αὐτὴν ἑαυτὸν ἀπέκαψεν, ἵν’ ἐπ’ αἰδέας ἔχῃ διατρέ-
χειν μετ’ αὐτῆς. *Apol. de fuga sua.* p. 335. E. *Vid. et*
Hist. Arian. ad Monach. p. 360. B.

those whom he blamed, or dissemble any part of their fault. And yet I do not perceive, that he had received any intelligence of those last mentioned aggravating circumstances. He speaks of their dwelling (y) under the same roof, of (z) their cohabiting together, eating at the same table, sitting together, and discoursing freely and pleasantly in the day-time. But they did not lye (a) together. He plainly supposeth, that (b) they had different apartments, and that there were others, particularly women-servants, in the house with them. In that way of acting it may be reckoned, that their virtue would not be in any immediate danger. However, undoubtedly, notwithstanding such precautions, some would be suspicious. Which was enough to render this practise offensive. And therefore the Fathers of the Council of *Nice* ordained

(y) . . . τῆς ὁμοσκηνίας ταύτης. *Contr. eos. Esc. T. 1. p. 229. B. . . ὁμοσκηνίας ταύτης. Ib. p. 233. B. . . τῆς συνοικήσεως ταύτης. Ib. D.*

(z) . . . νέος . . . κόρη συνοικῶν παρθένω, καὶ συγκαθήμεναι, καὶ συνδύειπνον, καὶ συναλεγομέναι δι' ἡμέρας· τῶν γὰρ ἄλλων ἐδὲν προσίθηναι. . . *Ib. p. 231. B. . . ἀλλ' ὅτι τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχων οἰκίαν, καὶ τραπέζης, καὶ λόγων κοινωνῶν, καὶ μετὰ παρρησίας πολλῆς. Ib. C.*

(a) *Ubi supra. p. 241. D. E. p. 254. fin.*

(b) *P. 264.*

daind in one of their canons, " that no
" Bishop, Presbyter, or Deacon, or any
" other of the clergie, should have an intro-
" duced woman, unless she be a mother, or
" sister, or aunt, or however a person liable
" to no suspicion." But I need not enlarge
farther by way of introduction to my argu-
ment.

That this practise is referred to, and cen-
sured in these epistles, is manifest from some
passages to be now produced: " We (c) are
" persuaded, says the writer, that you will
" mind these things, which are necessarie to
" your salvation. But we speak as we do,
" because of the evil fame and report con-
" cerning impudent men, who dwell with
" virgins under a pretense of piety, and put
" their souls in danger. . . It is altogether
" unfit, that they who are Christians, and
" fear God, should act thus."

Setting forth his own conduct, and that of
others, whom he represents as exemplarie,

G

he

(c) . . . fed ita loquimur de iis quæ loquimur, propter fa-
mam et rumorem malam de hominibus impudentibus, qui ha-
bitant cum virginibus praetextu pietatis, et conjiciunt animam
suam in periculum. . . Prorsus non decet Christianos et ti-
mentes Deum ita conversari. Alii autem edunt et bibunt cum
virginibus. &c. *Ep. i. c. 10. Wetsten.*

he says: " We (*d*) do not dwell with vir-
 " gins, nor have we any concern with them.
 " We do not eat and drink, where a virgin
 " is. Nor do we lye [sleep] where a vir-
 " gin lyes. Nor do women wash our feet,
 " or anoint us. We never lye, [or sleep,]
 " where a virgin is, who is unmarried, and
 " fit for marriage. Though she be alone,
 " and in another place, [or part of the house,]
 " we do not spend the night there."

In another chapter. " We (*e*) that are
 " holy, do not eat and drink with women.
 " Nor do women, or virgins, minister to
 " us, or wash our feet, or anoint us. Nor
 " do we lye, [sleep,] where women lye,
 " that we may be in all things without of-
 " fense."

After-

(*d*) Cum virginibus non habitamus, et inter illas nihil ha-
 bemus negotii. Et cum virginibus nec edimus, nec bibimus.
 Nec lavant mulieres pedes nostros, nec ungunt nos. Et pro-
 fus ubi dormit virgo, quae viri non est, aut filia nubilis, non
 dormimus: etiamsi sit in aliò loco sola, non pernoctamus ibi.
Ep. 2. c. 1. W.

(*e*) Nos sancti cum mulieribus, nec edimus, nec bibimus,
 nec ministrant nobis mulieres vel virgines. Et mulieres non la-
 vant nobis pedes; nec ungunt nos, et non conveniunt nobis
 mulieres, neque dormimus, ubi dormiunt mulieres, ut simus
 sine reprehensione. &c. *Ep. 2. c. 3. W.*

Afterwards, in another chapter, “ Even
 “ (f) after the Lord was risen from the
 “ dead, when *Marie* came running to the
 “ sepulchre, and falling down at his feet,
 “ and worshiping him, sought to touch him,
 “ he said unto her: *Touch me not. For I*
 “ *am not yet ascended to my Father.* [John
 “ xx. 17.] Is it not then wonderful, that
 “ the Lord permitted not that blessed wo-
 “ man *Marie* to touch his feet! And you
 “ dwell with them, and women and virgins
 “ minister to you, and you lye, where they
 “ lye. And women wash your feet, and anoint
 “ you. . . Many holy women have ministred
 “ to the saints out of their substance, as the

G 2

“ *Shu-*

(f) Nec hoc solum, sed etiam postquam surrexit Dominus a mortuis, et veniret Maria ad sepulchrum currens, et sedens ad pedes Domini, et adorans eum, et quaerens eum apprehendere, ipse dixit ei: *Noli me tangere. Nondum enim adscendi ad Patrem meum.* Nonne igitur mirabile est de Domino, quod non permisit Mariae mulieri beatae, ut tangeret pedes ejus: tu autem habitas cum illis, et tibi ministrant mulieres et virgines: et dormis, ubi illae dormiunt: et lavant tibi pedes, et ungunt te mulieres? . . . Mulieres autem multae sanctae ministrarunt sanctis e possessionibus suis, sicut ministravit fulamitis Elisae, sed cum eo non habitavit, et ipse Propheta in domo seorsim habitavit . . . Domino Jesu Christo ministrarunt mulieres e possessionibus suis, sed cum illo non habitârunt. Etiam Apostolis, etiam Paulo reperimus ministrasse mulieres, sed cum illis non habitârunt. *Ep. 2. c. 15. W.*

“ *Shunamite* woman ministred to *Elisba*. But
 “ she did not dwell with him. For the
 “ Prophet dwelled in a house by himself.
 “ [2 K. iv. 8. , 10.] Women ministred to
 “ the Lord Jesus Christ out of their sub-
 “ stance, [Luke viii. 3.] But they did not
 “ dwell with him. We also find that wo-
 “ men ministred to the other Apostles, and
 “ to *Paul*. But they did not dwell with
 “ them.”

I need not to transcribe any more. Here is enough, to shew the occasion and design of these epistles. However, there is still one thing more to be taken notice of, which will fully determine the point. The people complained of by St. *Cyprian*, and others, were ecclesiastics, and women, who made profession of virginity. So it is here. Both these letters are addressed to *virgins*. And it is implied, that they were pure in body, or free from carnal pollutions. “ Whoever,
 “ says (g) the author, professeth before the
 “ Lord,

(g) *Quicumque enim profitetur coram Domino, se servaturum castitatem, debet cingi omni virtute sancta Dei, et si vere in timore crucifixit corpus suum propter pietatem, deprecatur verbum, dicens, Crescite et multiplicamini, et totam mentem et cogitationem, et concupiscentiam mundi hujus, et deli-*

“ Lord, that he will keep his chastity, ought
“ to be clothed with every virtue, and if he
“ has truly crucified his body for the sake of
“ piety, he deprecates that saying, *encrease*
“ *and multiply*, and all concupiscence, and
“ all the delights of this world, and shuns
“ all those snares, by which he might be
“ endangered.”

And presently afterwards, in the next chapter. “ For (*b*) this cause he separates
“ himself from the desires of the body, and
“ not only deprecates that, *encrease and*
“ *multiply*, but desires the promised hope,
“ prepared and laid up in heaven, even a
“ better place, [or recompense,] than that of
“ those who have been holy in the state of
“ marriage.”

Nor does this author any where charge
those to whom he writes with any acts of un-
cleanness:

delicias, et ebrietatem, et omnem amorem ejus, et otium ejus.
. . . et exinanitus est ab omni conversatione mundi hujus, et ex
laqueis et retibus et impedimentis ejus. *Ep. i. c. 3. W.*

(*b*) Propterea separat se ab omnibus concupiscentiis corporis, et non solum deprecatur illud, *fructificate et multiplicare*, sed desiderat spem promissam et praeparatam et positam in coelis Deo, qui promittit ore, et non mentitur . . . locum celebrem in domo Dei, excellentiorem filiis et filiabus, et excellentiorem illis, qui conjuges fuerunt in sanctitate. *Ibid. c. 4.*

cleanneſſe: but he adviſeth them to (*i*) keep more out of the way of temptation, and (*k*) alſo to ſhew a greater regard for the opinion of men, and avoid whatever might be an occaſion of offence and ſcandal.

This being the caſe, we now ſee the reaſon of ſome things, which otherwiſe would not be eaſily accounted for. *Fiſt*, We ſee the reaſon of the addreſſe of theſe epiſtles, which at fiſt ſeems odd and whimſical. They are addreſſed (*l*) to *virgins, and virgins*. So in the fiſt chapter, and twice in ſecond, and frequently throughout the epiſtles.

Which

(*i*) . . . et exinanitus eſt ab omni converſatione mundi hujus, et ex laqueis et retibus et impedimentis ejus. *Ep. i. cap. 3. f.*

. . . et conjiciunt animam ſuam in periculum, et eunt cum illis in ſemita et in deſerto ſoli viam plenam periculis, et plenam offendiculis et laqueis et foveis. *Ibid. c. 10.*

(*k*) . . . ut ſimus ſine reprehentione in omnibus, ne quis in nobis offendatur. &c. *Ep. ii. c. 3.*

. . . et ne demus occaſionem illis, qui volunt, ut teneant occaſionem poſt nos, et loquantur de nobis mala, et ut nemini ſimus offendiculo. &c. *Ib. cap. 5.*

(*l*) Virginibus (*fratribus*) beatis, qui conſtituerunt ſervare virginitatem propter regnum coelorum, et virginibus (*ſororibus*) ſanctis in Deo, ſalutem. *cap. 1.* Unicuique virginum (*fratrum*) et virginum (*ſorum*) . . . Qui autem vere ſunt virgines (*fratres*) et virgines (*ſores*) audiunt eum qui dixit. . . *cap. 2.*

Which Mr. *Wetstein*, and rightly, as I suppose, renders *virgins*, brethren, and *virgins*, sisters. *Chrysostom* pronounced two orations for the sake of these people: one "against those who had with them subintroduced virgins:" the other, "that canonical women ought not to dwell with men." But this writer applies to both together, and calls them *virgins*. Secondly, we now also see the reason, why the (m) good conduct of the preachers of the gospel is so much insisted upon in these epistles. They were clergymen, who offended in this point, and therefore needed to be admonished to take more care both of their virtue, and their reputation, and not to give offense to other people. Thirdly, that expression, relating to this matter, which we saw just now, *men, who dwell with virgins under a pretense of piety*, appears remarkable, and leads to the following observation. The ecclesiastics, now complained of, were generally, or for the most part, men of religion and virtue. Being desirous to have the attendance and assistance of a woman in their domestic affairs, they pitched upon such as were virgins by profession, whom

(m) *Vid. ep. i. c. 11. 12. et ep. ii. passim.*

whom they judged to be the most unexceptionable of any, and lest liable to suspicion. Determined to keep themselves pure, they supposed, that if notwithstanding all their care an evil thought or desire should arise in them, such persons would not encourage, but check and controul it. So *they dwelled with virgins under a pretense of piety*, as this writer says. It has often seemed strange to me, that these *subintroduced women*, mentioned by ancient writers, were continually spoken of as *virgins*, and *devoted to Christ*, and the like. We here see the reason, why such were chosen and preferred to others. This observation first came into my mind upon reading these epistles. And it is referred to the consideration of the learned.

The time therefore of these epistles is to be collected from that of this practise. When it was first introduced, and when it ceased, may not be easily decided. It was taken notice of and censured by *Cyprian* about the middle of the third centurie. And not long after that time *Paul of Samosata*, Bishop of *Antioch*, and divers of the Clergie of that diocese were charged with it. And if *Chrysostom's* orations upon occasion of it, were not

composed till after the commencement of his episcopate, as the (n) *Benedictin* editors think, it subsisted to the end of the fourth centurie. And doubtless there were instances of it in the following centurie. *Chrysostom* speaks of it (o) as a new thing, that had arisen in that age. But the expressions of orators may be understood with latitude. However, it is very probable, that it did not appear in the early days of Christianity, nor till after the death of all the Apostles, and their disciples, called apostolical men: consequently, not in the time of *Clement*, Bishop of *Rome*. And if the writer of these epistles refers to it, as I think he plainly does, he is not *Clement* disciple of the Apostle *Paul*.

4. I observe, in the fourth place, that this writer exceeds in his praises of virginity, and in his recommendations of it. Mr. *Wetstein* is sensible, that (p) what he says is not agree-

H

able

(n) *Vide Monitum. T. i. p. 227.*

(o) . . . ἐπὶ τῇ νεότητι ἡμετέρᾳ καὶ τρίτῃ ἐπεικρίθη τὸ πρῶτον καὶ τὸ δεύτερον καὶ τὸ τρίτον. *T. i. p. 228. A. B.*

(p) Erunt fortasse, quibus harum epistolarum scriptor videtur et matrimonii esse iniquior, coelibatum vero nimium extollere . . . Aliterque fateor, de coelibatu et matrimonio sensit Clemens, quam M. Lutherus. At nondum probatum est, illum male sensitse. *Wetst. Prolegom. p. vii.*

able to the Protestant doctrine. Nevertheless he thinks it is not unreasonable, nor unscriptural. If I am not mistaken, I could easily shew, that a great deal said upon this head by the writer of these epistles is destitute of support and countenance from the doctrine of the New Testament. But instead of doing that at present, I would observe, that he differs from *Clement*, who in the first chapter of his epistle to the *Corinthians* says: “ You
 “ were subject to your rulers, giving becom-
 “ ing respect to elders. Young men you
 “ taught to be modest. The women you
 “ exhorted to do all things unblamably
 “ loving their husbands, as is fit, . . and ma-
 “ naging the affairs of the house with pro-
 “ priety and modestie.” And in the 21. chapter: “ Let us respect our rulers, and ho-
 “ nor the elders: young men let us instruct
 “ in the discipline and fear of God: our
 “ wives let us direct to that which is good,
 “ that they may shew forth the agreeable be-
 “ haviour of chastity. . . . And let our chil-
 “ dren be bred up in the discipline of Christ.” So *Clement*. Whether he was married, or single, I know not. But this apostolical man, to render his exhortations more forcible, joyns him-

himself with men in the marriage-state. Nothing of this kind is to be found in the writer of these two epistles. He scorns to touch upon these points. The virtues of the marriage-state are below his regard.

He differs likewise from St. *Cyprian*, who (q) in treating on this subject, adviseth rather that these virgins should marry, if they are not able to persevere in the purpose of purity.

He differs also from St. *Chrysostom*, who in the second of his orations before-mentioned says to those virgins : “ If (r) you desire
“ to have men to cohabit with you, you
“ should not have chosen virginity, but
“ should have married. For it would be
“ better to marry, than to act thus in a state
“ of virginity. God does not condemn marriage, nor do men disparage it. For it is

H 2

honor-

(q) Quodsi ex fide se Christo dicaverunt, pudicae et castae sine ulla fabula perseverent, et ita fortes et stabiles praemium virginitatis expectent. Si autem perseverare nolunt, vel non possunt, melius est ut nubant, quam in ignem delictis suis cadant. Certe nullum fratribus et sororibus scandalum faciant. *Cypr. ad Pompon. ep. 4. al. 62.*

(r) Εἰ γὰρ ἀνδρας ἐπιθυμῆς ἔχειν συνοικῶντας, ἐκ ἑδαι παρθενίαν ἐλέσθαι, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τὸν γάμον ἐλθεῖν· πολλῶ γὰρ βέλτιον γαμῆν ἐκείνως, ἢ παρθενεύειν ἕως· κ. λ. *Ubi supra. p. 253. E. 254. A.*

“ honorable, offending none, injuring none,
 “ But virginity, in the company of men,
 “ is worse and more offensive to all, than
 “ fornication itself.” Afterwards in the
 same oration he says, “ it (s) would be
 “ better for these virgins to marry twice,
 “ than to act as they did, and be the occa-
 “ sion of so much scandal.” I refer (t) to
 some other like places in these homilies of
Cbrysoftom. But nothing of this kind appears
 in these epistles.

He who should read what this (u) writer
 says, in praise of virginity : how glorious, and
 how arduous it is, the great examples, by
 which it is encouraged, and what peculiar
 rewards it is entitled to : must, I apprehend,
 think it strange, that for preventing ill con-
 sequences, and that men might not be led in-
 to a snare, he did not reckon himself obliged
 to add something concerning the lawfulnessse
 and purity of marriage, and the expedience
 of it for most men : which are so often in-
 timated, and expressly asserted in the New
 Testa-

(s) Πολλῶ γὰρ βέλτιον ἐνὶ, καὶ δευτέρῳ συνάπτεσθαι γάμῳ,
 ἢ τοιαῦτα ἀχρημονεῖν. κ. λ. *Ib.* p. 265. D.

(t) *Vid.* p. 234. D. 236. D. E.

(u) *Vid.* ep. i. cap. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8.

Testament, and may be easily discerned by the reason, and observation and experience of mankind.

It is very likely, that before this practise obtained, the marriage of the Clergie lay under some restraints. They who doubt of it, may read the notes of *Gothofred* upon a law of *Honorius* and *Theodosius* the younger, relating to this very matter. I transcribe from him a few lines only (x) below. The marriage of the Clergie was not forbid by any canon of the church, or law of the state. But it lay under discouragements, and was restrained by the prevailing opinion of men. Celibacie was more reputable. And many Clergimen coveted the honour of it, who found it burdensome. And virginity likewise being much applauded, many women were induced to make a profession of it: who afterwards knew not how to perform their engagements, nor to get rid of them.

Gra-

(x) Extraneas, inquam, mulieres vetantur clerici sibi adsciscere. Nempe ex quo coelibatus clericalis mos paulatim inolescere coepit, atque hâc etiam ratione clerici probabilem seculo disciplinam agere, seque seculo de coelibatus seu continentiae voto commendare instituerunt, clam tamen atque alia ratione voluptates suas explere alicubi rerum experimentis visi sunt, *κρυφῶν ἀπορρέοντες*. &c. In *Cod. Theod. lib. 16. cap. 2. l. 44.*

Gradually the celibacie of the Clergie and virginity of women grew more and more in vogue. And the high notions, which the writer of these epistles has of virginity, without saying any thing in favour of marriage, make me think, that he did not write soon, but rather not till a good while after the rise of the practise, of which we have been speaking.

The Author anonymous.

IV. Who the author was, cannot be determined. Probably, he was a Bishop. It was most becoming a man in that high station, to write letters with exhortations to Christian people, especially to such as made profession of celibacie and virginity. Moreover it may be argued from the authoritative manner, in which the second epistle concludes.

I do by no means charge the writer with imposture. I do not believe, he had the least thought of such a thing. It should be observed, that there is not at the beginnings or endings of these epistles any distinguishing inscription. There is no name of the writer, nor any hint of his character and station. Nor is there any intimation of the city or coun-

countrey, where they lived, to whom the epistles are addressed. There is only a title prefixed to these epistles, to this purpose: *The (y) first, or the second epistle of the blessed Clement disciple of the Apostle Peter.* And at the end is that common phrase. *Here (z) ends the first, or the second epistle of Clement disciple of Peter.* These titles, or inscriptions, as I imagine, were placed there by some late editor, who did not know who was writer of the epistles. It might be done by him ignorantly, or designedly. Which of the two, we cannot determine. He might, I say, herein act honestly. Possibly he really supposed them to be the epistles of *Clement*: though, if he did, he was much mistaken. Or he might do it designedly, with a view to procure the more regard for the epistles, which he was publishing.

As there is nothing in the epistles to distinguish the author, or the people, to whom he wrote, I have suspected, that he was anonymous, and that he designed to be so. When he formed the intention to write upon this sub-

(y) Porro Epistola prior beati Clementis discipuli Petri Apostoli.

(z) Explicit Epistola secunda Clementis discipuli Petri.

subject, he determined to conceal himself. He hoped, that his exhortations might in that way have the greater effect. Having thus fixed his resolution, he wrote, in the form of epistles, upon the subject, which at that time was much discoursed of, and addressed himself to those who were chiefly concerned, sending them admonitions and directions according to the best of his judgment. However, this is only conjecture. For when these epistles were first published, the writer might be well known, though afterwards his name and character were forgotten.

*Import-
ance of
these Epi-
stles.*

V. From the extracts, placed at the beginning of this Dissertation, we learn, that the epistle to the *Hebrews* was received by the writer of these epistles. And from the numerous quotations out of the Old and the New Testament, we perceive the great regard, which Christians had for the sacred Scriptures. Of which we have seen many proofs in the collections that have been made from the ancient writers of the church.

We

We likewise discern, that at the time of writing these epistles virginity was in great esteem.

But if a true account has been now given of the time and occasion of these epistles, we cannot from them learn the date of any of the books of the New Testament. Mr. *Wetstein*, supposing, that these epistles were writ by *Clement of Rome*, thinks, that (a) from the quotations here made of St. *John's* Gospel, it may be proved, that St. *John* wrote earlier, than many have imagined, or about the 32. year after our Lord's ascension. I do not now concern myself about the time of publishing St. *John's* Gospel. But if these epistles were not writ before the middle of the third centurie, no argument for the early age of that Gospel can be drawn from the quotations of it by this writer. And though the writer were *Clement*, Mr. *Wetstein's* argument would not be conclusive, because the exact

I

time

(a) Hinc etiam consequitur, Evangelium Joannis non ab eo jam decrepito et fere centenario, et post mortem Clementis, sed diu antea esse editum, adeoque inscriptionem codicum Graecorum, qui illud Evangelium anno 32. post ascensionem Christi . . . scriptum fuisse testantur, ad verum proprius accedere. *Proleg. p. ix.*

time of *Clement's* episcopate is not certainly known. At lest, there are different opinions about it: some placing it in the year of Christ 61. and onwards, others in 69. or 70. And others say, he was not Bishop before the year 91. or 93. Many years ago, when I made my extracts out of *Clement's* epistle to the *Corinthians*, writ in the name of the Church of *Rome*, it seemed to me most probable, that (b) it was writ about the year 96. And the late learned Dr. *Waterland*, whose good judgement in such things is allowed, readily declared (c) his acquiescence in the reasons there alleged. These epistles therefore might be *Clement's*, and yet not writ much before the end of the first centurie. Consequently, the quotations therein made of St. *John's* Gospel will not prove it to have been writ before the year of our Lord 70.

Conclusion.

VI. I have now made a fair examination of these two epistles. I hope, I have given no offense to Mr. *Wetstein*, or his friends.

That

(b) See the *Credib. P. 2. Ch. ii.*

(c) See Dr. *Waterland's* Review of the doctrine of the Eucharist. p. 33. Cambridge 1737.

That learned man knows very well, that the pretensions of writings, which bear the names of eminent ancients, ought to be carefully weighed, before they are admitted. And I persuade myself, that upon farther consideration Mr. *Wetstein* will be convinced he has too hastily published these epistles as *Clement's* Bishop of *Rome*. And I am apt to think, that he and other learned men will discern in them more marks of a later age, than have been taken notice of by me.

When tidings were first brought hither, that Mr. *Wetstein* had received two new epistles of *Clement* out of the East, several of my friends and readers signified their desire, that when they should be published, I would observe the testimonie therein afforded to the books of the New Testament. Which service I have now performed, according to my ability. They supposed it to be a necessarie part of the work, in which I have been long employed. Which is not barely a *Bibliothèque of Ecclesiastical Authors*, or *Memoirs of Ecclesiastical Historie*, but was begun, and has been carried on with a view of shewing the truth of the Christian Religion, particularly, the truth and credibility of the evangelical

gelical historie, and the antiquity, genuinenesse, and authority of the books of the New Testament, the original records of the doctrine and miracles of our Saviour and his Apostles. And all along great care has been taken, to distinguish genuine and supposititious writings. Which I now reflect upon with much satisfaction. In this method witnessses, when produced, appear in their true time and character. And every one is able to judge of the value of their testimonie.

The E N D.



